GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898-1899

~~191~~ .

(Mungoo)

File No. 6 (Section)

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month March 1902

SUBJECT.

Complaints against Komara Vellalla
Arichilla of Sri Kalahasteeswara Swamy Dev
at Nagari about his Conduct and not worshipping for months together in the Temple.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES LATER REFERENCES.

150-13

2155

(1)

ನಂಬರು.
664-5
Encl 3

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರವರ ಹುಜೂರು ಈಭೇರಿ.

ಮೆಮೋರಾಂಡಂ.

ಮ—ಳ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಳಳ—ಂ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲ

ಇರುವ ಃಲ್ಲಿ—ಂ ಮಿ ಚಿಶ್ಚಳಳಳಿಳಿಳಿ॥ಳಳ—ಅ ಚಿ-ದ ಳಿ—ಂ ಮ—ಂ ಳಡಿ ದಃಲ್ಲಿಕಳ
ಹೆಜ್ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಜಾಹಿರ್ಸ್ಥಿ
ಎ ಷ ಎಳು—ಂ ಸ ಇಂದ 260-463-501 ಳಿ ಳಂ ಬ ಡು ಳಳ—ಅ ಚಿ ದ ಳಲು 3 ಳು—ಲ
ಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೂಹೆ ನೇಃಪುರಸ್ಕಾಂ ನೇ ನಂಬರ್ ಆಜ್ಞೆಯನ್ನ
ಎಳ—ಂ ಕ ಸ್ಲೆ ಯು ಂ ದ ಂ ಲಿಂ—ಬಲು—ಪ ಸ್ಲೆ—ಬಿಂ ಳಳ—ಂ ಳಲ್ಲ
ಬಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಳು ಬ ರ—ಂ ಲು
—ಅ—ಗ ಳ ಮ—ಂ ಷ ಳ ಕ ಳ ಳ— ಬಳಿಗೆ ಈಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ.

ಬತಾರೀಖು 8 ನೇ ಮೂಹೆ ಫೈ ಬ್ರ ವ ರಿ 1894 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ.

ಪೊಕ್ಕಾಂ. ಬಿಂ ಳಳ—ಂ ಲ—

ಸಹಿ 8/2/94
ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟ್.

Endt issued.

Mysore Government Central Press, Bangalore—17-12-92—1,000.

28-1-95

Gen. Serial No. 61.] 47

OFFICE RECORD 456 MUZRAI BRANCH

1894-95.

From The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore District

To Muzrai Superintendent
~~The Secretary to Govt~~
~~Revenue~~ of Mysore.

Dated 21st January 1895.
Despatched 25-1-95 Do
Received 28/1

Enclosures—No. 1 & 2 files & Vernacular Papers

General No.
No. 872.

Referring to his Canarese Rubkari No. 664-5 dated 9th February last, forwarding for report petitions of Anniachar and others complaining of the conduct of the Archik of the Rameswara and other Temples at the Kasaba of the Magadi Taluk.

Referring to the above, has the honor to forward a Memo on the points

Vide Muzrai No. 965 8/6 h/95
from the same dated 20-5-95

mentioned in the petition prepared by Mr. Cosgrove Sami Naidu with whom the Undersigned generally agrees.

2. The file of Vernacular papers in connection with the subject ending with the Amildar's dos.y and 84 is also enclosed.

L. Narasimhan
For Dy. Commissioner,
Nlr

Memo.

1. Rameswara — 5-15-5.
2. Someswara — 4-4-9
3. Prasanna Rameswara.
4. Ganga Narasimha

At Nagady Kasaba, the first two of the marginally noted Temples have cash allowance as well as Inam lands, and the remaining ones only Inam lands, assigned by Government. One Komaricleshkil is the Archik of all these Temples.

2. Annia-char, Rama Pandit and others have complained to the Taluk, this Office, and the Inspector Superintendent, stating that the Archik frequently absents himself without leave and thus worship is not rendered regularly, that owing to his absence no new thread was served to the God Rameswara on the important day of Sravani in the year 1893-94, that no Kum Kumarchane was performed on the second Friday Sravana month of the same year, that the Images Vrushaba and Ganapati in the Someswara Temple, though damaged are worshipped while they are to be

reinstated after due consecration, that he, being a widower, has per-formed the Agama Service, con-trary to Agamee principles, that he has kept a woman of a different caste and as such he is not worthy of being retained as Archik, and that he should be removed. The Muzrai Superintendent has forwarded the petition addressed to him to the Muzrai Assistant Commissioner with Canarese Rubkari No. 665-5- dated 9th February 1894 for enquiry and report.

3. From the records submitted by the Amildar the facts appear as follow:-

(1) A petition presented to the Taluk Office by Anniachar and others on 26th August 1893, complaining of the Archik's absence and of the non-performance of the worship was referred to the Sheristadar for per-sonal inspection and report. He immediately enquired of the Archiks mother, inspected the Temple and

Submitted his reply with a Mahazir executed by 9 persons to the effect that the Archik had been absent for 3 days, that no new thread was served to the Daly Rameswara on the important day of Sravani. The Mahazir also says that the Archik was absent at a village in the Vela-mangala Taluk where his Rept woman had gone.

(2) The record relating to the petition of Ramabhat dated 19th September 1893 to the Taluk Office bringing to notice the Archik's absence without permission on the said Monday shews that the Archik who wanted leave, went away to bring the Substitute as ordered, but never made his appearance.

(3) Again, that the Archik was absent for 4 days, appears to be true from the enquiry held on Ramapandi's petition, presented to the Taluk on 11th March 1894. From the remark made

by the Sheristadar on the petition, it will be observed that the Archiks' mother, who was enquired of, stated that her son had gone to Bangalore in search of a girl for marriage, and if he would not return that day by the time of worship, she would get a Vupanita boy and have the service rendered by him, and if she should fail to find one she would herself offer Cocoanut &c. and prostrate before the God.

(4) The absence of the Archik is again referred to by the petitioners in their petition dated 2nd June 1894 to the Taluk but no enquiry seems to have been held on this occasion.

(5) Except Annachar and Rama bhat, all the petitioners who have signed the petition dated 8th September 1893 addressed to this Office, have stated that they signed the same at the instance of the persons named above and that they seldom go to the Temple.

(6)

(6) The Archik has deposed that Amiachar, one of the petitioners asked to sell his lands to him, but they having been sold to others for a larger amount than what the petitioner offered, the petitioner bears enmity to him, that he is a Vaishnava and does not therefore ordinarily make offerings in this Temple, which is a Siva, that Ramapundit has taken up Temple Pudavat money assigned by a devotee Venkatadri Setti for the Durpano-chava processin, which is not carried on, that Ramapundit has borrowed Rs 2 /. from him, and if money is not lent when asked, he takes part with wicked persons and brings up false complaints, that some of the other petitioners are not on good terms with him, that he was present in the Town on the 2nd Friday in the Sravana month

but none came to get the Kum-
bhabishekam performed, that only
the Ganapati Image is damaged,
which fact is intimated to the
authorities and that the persons
who have signed the Mahazar are
neither the devotees nor men of
importance.

(7) Some of the devotees examined
on behalf of the Archik have
stated that they also do not fre-
quently visit the Temple, but
whenever they visited they found
the service was regularly performed
by the Archik and that none of
them go to other Temples.

(8) Statement given by the Archik
before the Police on a complaint of
theft in his house shews that he
has kept a woman, but in his
deposition he has stated that he has
employed a woman for domestic service

(9) Petitioners Annicchar and

Rama Pundit have in their petition dated 2nd June last, quoted two verses to shew that a widower or sonless person is not entitled to do Agama service, but on the contrary, the Archik has himself performed the same in the Car festivals of Rameswara and Someswara Temples. The Archik contends that the name of the book from which the verses are borrowed, is not stated, that since the time of the death of his wife which took place about 7 years ago, he has performed the service, that he is informed by Agnica Nanjund deekshut of Devunhully, of an authority allowing persons situated as he is to do the Service in unavoidable cases and that the present complaint is malicious. In support of this statement a "sloka" is quoted.

(10) The late Amildar is of opinion that as complaints against the Archik are numerous he should

be allowed 6 months time within which he should rectify his conduct and become a married man for which he is capable both in point of age and circum- -nces. The present Amildar is that the Archik who is alon ld not render worship in all th w Temples at one and the same e, that the villagers do not go to the Temple as he does not possess good conduct, and has not earned their good will, but that his absence is not brought to his notice since he took charge of the Talvk.

4. Some months back the undersigned, when visited the Talvk inspected the Temples which were not at all kept clean. The Archik had taken no interest in their good preservation. His moral con- -duct also appeared to be not good. In spite of repeated warnings, he was negligent towards the rendering of the service. The undersigned therefore considers that another person may be appointed to do the service, till he becomes a married man.

8/25-2/Nov/94 Copy (signed) B. Coopooswami Naidu

for Dy Commissioner

1048

ಕಲಬುರಗಿ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯ ಸೇಡಂ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಮಳಖೇಡ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 1 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 1.00 ಎಕರೆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಪ್ರಾಥಮಿಕ ಶಾಲೆ ಕಟ್ಟಡ ನಿರ್ಮಿಸಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ನೀಡಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ

573

1057

ನಂಬರ್ 7307/66

98 ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸೂಪರ್ಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರವರ

7,32. ಹುಜೂರು ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ಮಂಗಳ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಆಮೀಲರಿಗೆ

ಬರಸಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಅದಾಗಿ—

ಮಂಗಳ ತಿಕೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಗಂಗಾ ಮೂಲ
ಸ್ಥಳ ವಳ್ಳಿಕೆ ಮೂಲಸ್ಥಾನವಲ್ಲದ ಗಂಗಾಕ್ಷೇತ್ರದಿಂದ
ಮಂಗಳ ದೀಪಕ್ಕೆ ಗಂಗಾತೀರದಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು
ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ
ಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿದು ಬಂದು- ಮಂಗಳಸ್ನಾನ ಮಾಡುವ
ಅಂದು- ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಗಳ ಸ್ನಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ
ವೆಂಬ ಕಾರಣ ಮಂಗಳದೀಪಕ್ಕೆ ಗಂಗಾಜಲವು ಸಾಲದಾಗುವ
ಬಹುಮಾನವು ಮುಂದೆ ದೇವಸ್ಥಾನದವರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ
ಆಗುವುದು- ಕಾರಣ- ಕೆಲವು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಮೂಢನಂಬಿಕೆಯಿಂದ
ಭಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಂತೆ- ಸ್ನಾನವಿಲ್ಲದೆ
ಗಂಗೆಯನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದವನಾಗಿಯೂ ಬಿಳಿಗಡಿಗೆಯು
ಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿಯೂ, ಮೂರಲ್ಲವೆಂಬಿಕೆಯುಳ್ಳವನಾಗಿಯೂ
ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಮೂರಿಂದರಷ್ಟಾದರೂ ಬ್ರಾಹ್ಮಣರನ್ನು ಸಂತೋಷಪಡಿ
ಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ

ನೋಕ್ಕಾಂ

ಕಾರೀಖು

Muzrai Superintendent.

M.G.C.P.B.—2-8-91 100

(6)

Murrai Superintendent

357

52

1689

20/2/95

ನಂಬರ್

988

ವೈಸರಾಯಿ ಸ ಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರವರ

ಹುಜೂರು ಕಛೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

732

(5)

ಸೂ ಕ ನೆ ತಹಲೂಕು ಆಡಿಟರರಿಗೆ.

ಬಾಪಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ ನಿರೂಪ ಇದಾಗಿ—

[illegible]

Direct [illegible]

Muzaraye Superintendent

M.G.C P, B—2-8-94—1,000

16/2/95

No. 880

30/145

5-48

2nd Reminder

రూబకారి.

మైసూరు సంస్థానద ముజరాయి సూపరింటెండెంట్ మి॥ యం. శ్రీనివాసాచారూ.

ఇ తారీ॥ 26 నే మాహె ఇవనవ

రి 1894నే ఇసవి మొక్కాం,శిరస్తా

ళ్ళూరు.

చిరో

Mnarai Superintendent.

మంగళవారదిన-మొదుండల్లారు మీ-ల్లిగాం

మీ లక్ష్మీరమ్మనోరి దేవీ నళ్ళ అబీ-ర్ణీ- రోం

మంత్రదర్శిశేషనన తరీ మీ విజ్ఞాపనాంసి రిస్తోం ల

అర్జీళ్ళ నళ్ళే చింగళ్ళూంరు తిర్జిర్జీమ్మ చరం

యు అశీ క్లీంటీ-మింతిర్ద్రరమరిగే 1894నే

యుసవి జీ చ్రమరి మంజి 9నేమర్కూం

664-వ నేనంబర్ మీమాంచిందు చుల్ల్

మంజి 18నేమర్కూం 1184వ నేనంబర్రూం

బరీ-రిచిందు ఉళ్ళూంరి రీ లూ ఇంద్రమణ్ణ

ర నిదొన్నీ నళ్ళా అన్నీ వి అవరిందనమం

పం)

(3)

Reminder Rubkaru

Ref 3461/1076

14-2-95

Regd No
1345

ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿ ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವ ಸ್ಥಿರಾಸ್ತಿಯ ವಿವರ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಮೌಲ್ಯ ಹಾಗೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಂಪಾದಿಸಿದ ಬಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅದರ ಮೂಲ ಆದಾಯದ ವಿವರ ಹಾಗೂ ಅದರ ಮೌಲ್ಯ ಮತ್ತು

Part refo mutts
23-Dec-30

608 ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 131

(11)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 2

ಸನ್ 1895 ನೇಯ್ಕೆಯ ಶಿಲಾಶಾಸನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬರುವ 18 ಅಕ್ಷರಗಳು ಮಾತ್ರ ಲಭ್ಯವಿದ್ದು

22-4-95

609 Reg.No.

10

2

ಅಂಚೆಪತ್ರ ಅಥವಾ ಇಮೇಲ್ ಮೂಲಕ ಅರ್ಜಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಹ್ವಾನ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು. ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

- ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು.
- ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.
- ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು.
- ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗಲು ಯಾವುದೇ ಪ್ರಯಾಣ ಭತ್ಯೆ ನೀಡಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.
- ಅಭ್ಯರ್ಥಿಗಳು ಸಂದರ್ಶನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಜರಾಗುವಾಗ ಅಗತ್ಯ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು.

Reg No 1394

3-5-93

Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

Yours sincerely,

I am sorry that I cannot attend the meeting on account of my mother's illness. She has been ill for a week and I must look after her. I hope the meeting will be successful.

Please convey my apologies to the Secretary.

Yours faithfully,

Ramesh

5/12/15
Eng file

634

Reyhu 1418

(2)

Yours faithfully,

Mr. Manmohan Singh

Encl: As above.

Shri Ramesh Chandra Lahoti,
Secretary,
Ministry of Finance,
North Block,
New Delhi - 110001.

634

Reyhin 1418

Eng file

15.5

(13)

Reg No 1648

Regd No 1447

10/5/95-2

To,
The Secretary,
Bangalore Development Authority,
Bangalore.

Sir,

Sub: Allotment of site in Arkavathy Layout.

Ref: Application No. 1447

I am in receipt of your letter dated 10/5/95 intimating me that a site in Arkavathy Layout is allotted to me.

I am unable to accept the site allotted to me as I have already purchased a site in Arkavathy Layout. Hence I request you to cancel the allotment of site made in my favour.

Thanking you,

Yours faithfully,

659

13/5/95

Reg No 1487

1153

file

Regd
1666

17/6/95

717

Mumait Rao

Reg No 132

49

Engg Br. 22/7/98

19

ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ

Gen. Serial No. 31.] 164

1895-96

From The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Secretary to the Govt
~~Revenue~~ of Mysore.

Muzrai Department.

Dated 19th August 1895.
Despatched 20th "
Received 26/8

Enclosures—No. 3

General No.
D No. 205.

In continuation of
this office letter No. 872
dated 21st January 1895,
reporting on the petition
of Anniachar and another
of Nagady, has the honor
to forward herewith a
petition of Koneredeeks
-hata Archik of Ramés-
-vara temple &c. in Nagady
bringing to notice that
difficulty is experienced
in performing the Pooja,
the Paditara having been
stopped for the last two
years and praying that

and to request the favor
of early orders on the
subject.

In Munroe
Ty Dy Commissioner
OK

7/11/25

(21)

ng arrears of Jasdik Pay-
ble to the Temple, a regular
ill for the amount due
ray be submitted for
Sanction of Government.

The Vernacular records
re herewith returned.

By order
as
Muzrai Secretair

General Serial No 30.1

MUZARAI.

1896

From

The Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

The Deputy Commissioner of
Bangalore District

Dated 2nd
Despatched
Received February 1896

Enclosures No. 1

General No. 810 R
Muzarai F. No.

His no 872 dated 21st January
1895 reporting on the petition of
Amia Char and others of
Magadi, complaining of
certain misconduct on the
part of Komara Deekshit,
archak of the Rameswara
and 3 other Siva Temples in Kasaba
Magadi.

Adverting to the above
has the honor to State that,
apart from the complaints

from c — brought against the archak Komara
Kish t is evident from the records, that
de is also a
~~Deshita himself is~~ a person of very
loose ls and consequently unfit to hold
the archakship of these sacred Temples.

The archak Kumara Deekshat will therefore be placed under
suspension from office for a period of one year
from this date, after which the question of his
reinstatement will be considered if he should
be reported to have improved in conduct
and character.

2. The Deputy Commissioner is requested
to make the necessary arrangements for the
appointment of another qualified archak to
perform Puja in the temples during the period
of Komari Deekshit's suspension. If no qualified
person can be had from ~~[illegible]~~ the Sivanda archak
Class, a Vaidika Brahmin ~~Vydika~~ 3rd charge ~~Veda~~, may
be appointed to do Puja in the Temple under
Vaidika forms of worship and the Vaidik attached
to him As

613

1896–97

From The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore Dist

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.
Bangalore

Dated 30th January 1897.
Despatched 2nd —— Do ——
Received
General No.
No. 780.

Enclosure No. two.

His No. 810 dated 3rd February 1896, requesting that a qualified Archak may be appointed to the temples of Kote Rameswara Someswara &c at Nagadi vice Kumar Dikshit suspended, that a bill be submitted for arrears due to the permanent incumbent

In reply, has the honor to state that one Arkeswara Dikshit has been appointed to act for Kumara Dikshita. Two bills amounting to Rs 223-1- (one for Rs 219-13-8 and the other for Rs 3-3-4) due to Archak Kumara Dikshita and other temple servants

from duty brought against the archak Komara Deekshita, it is evident from the records, that ~~Komari Deekshita himself is a person~~ he is also a person of very loose morals and consequently unfit to hold the archakship of ~~sacred~~ these Temples.

2. The ~~archak~~ Komara Deekshat will therefore be placed under suspension from office for a period of one year from this date, after which the question of his reinstatement will be considered if he should be reported to have improved in conduct and character.

2. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to make the necessary arrangements for the appointment of another qualified archak to perform Puja in the temples during the period of Komari Deekshita's suspension. If no qualified person can be had from ~~[illegible]~~ the Sivarake archak Class, a ~~Vaidika~~ Vaidika Brahmin ~~versed in Vedas~~ Lord Shivarake, may be appointed to do Puja in the Temple under Vaidika form of worship and the Vaidik attached

613

1896–97

From The Dy Commissioner,
Bangalore Dist

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.
Bangalore

Dated 30th January 1897.
Despatched 2nd Do
Received
General No.
D No. 780.

Enclosure No. two.

His No. 810 dated 3rd February 1896, requesting that a qualified Archak may be appointed to the temples of Kote Rameswara, Someswara &c at Nagadi vice Kumar Dikshit suspended, that a bill be submitted for arrears due to the permanent incumbent.

In reply, has the honor to state that one Arkeswara Dikshit has been appointed to act for Kumara Dikshita. Two bills amounting to Rs 223-1- (one for Rs 219-13-8 and the other for Rs 3-3-4) due to Archak Kumara Dikshit and other temple servants

1/31/1897

are herewith forwarded for
sanction.

for Dy Commissioner

Gen. 31]

1897. 28

From The Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to Govt.
of Mysore
Revenue Dept.

Dated 17th
Despatched 18th December 97
Received

General No.
D No. 835

Enclosure No. 1 file

Inam's docket No. 810
of 3? February 1876

Reports that the conduct
of Venkamma of Konena
Agrahara, Archak of the
Ramaswamy Temple, Magadi
Taluk, since his re-
-instatement, has been
good —

Refer
18-12-97

as to archak's conduct
in favorably reported upon
no further action is required
at present

D. No. 835
En: 1 file

Bangalore District
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 17th December 1897.

To

The Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Muzrai Department.

Sir,

With reference to para 2 of your docket No. 810 dated the 13th February 1896, regarding the reinstatement of Komara Deekshit, archack of the Ramaswara temple of Magadi Kasaba, after the expiration of the period of suspension, I have the honor to state that from ~~the~~ yadi No. 405 dated the 25th November 1897 of the Closepet Sub Division officer, it appears that the conduct and behaviour of the said archack for the 6 months from the date of his reinstatement, have been good and that Puje is done properly.

2.— The vernacular records

are herewith sent for reference and return.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner

rmw

Recd. —

Letter No 835-97

17th Dec 1897 from

the Dy Bangalore Dr

~~Reported~~ reporting

that Komara Dikshi

Archak of the Sri

Ranganatha and

certain other temples

in Kasba Nagadi,

who was ~~to be~~ ordered

to be placed under

Suspension for one

year from Feb 1896,

on account of

neglect of duty and

other misdemeanors

was ~~restored~~ rein-

-stated in office

after the expiry of the

period of suspension
that
And since the Conduct
of the Archak has been
Satisfactory.

Order thereon. No 1030 dd 7th March/99
mur F 6-98
Enc Records

Recorded with the
Remark that under
the Circs reported the
question calls for
No further action
is called for in
the matter at present

Sd
J Muir-Secy

To The Dy Commr Bangalore Dt
Ext Sd Papers

MUZRAI

189 (80)

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

To

The Deputy Commr,
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 31.8.99

Despatched 1.9.99

Received

General No. 226

Muzrai F. No 6-98

Enclosure No. 3

His Order No. 780 dated 30th January 1897, submitting for sanction two bills amounting to Rs 219-13-8 and Rs 3-3-4 respectively being the arrears of Muzrai allowances payable to the Archak and other servants of the Sri Rameswara and Somes waraswami temples at Nagadi.

Has the honor to observe that the arrears of Muzrai allowances referred to in the above

are those due for the
period from September 1893
to June 1895. Thus, it is
now more than 4 years
since these allowances
have been left undrawn undisbursed by the persons concerned
under the late Chief Court's
Ord No. 8004-5 dated 10th
December 1877, hence
allowances left undrawn
for more than 6 months
will not, except for very satisfactory
reasons be allowed to be paid
In the present case, no
such reasons are adduced
and the payment of the
arrears in question cannot
therefore be now sanctioned.

2 The bills and other en-
-closures to his docket
cited above are accordingly
returned herewith.

By order

A
Hence Secretary

ನಂಬರ.

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಸೂಪರಿಂಟೆಂಡೆಂಟರವರ

ಹುಜೂರು ಕಚೇರಿಯಿಂದ.

ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಅಮಿಲರಿಗೆ.

ಮಂಗಳಕೆಕೆ-ನೆ ಸಂಬಂದಪ್ಪಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕೆಲ
ಯೋಗಾಂಪಲ್ಲಿಶ್ವರ ಜೀವನಸ್ಥಿನದ ಅರ್ಚಕರ
ಕೆಲಸಂಬಂಧ ದಿಲ್ಲಿಕೆಯನು ಗರದುಕೆಲ್ಲಿಂಡ
ಮಂಜಿವಲಿಪ್ಪಿರುವ 15ನೆಯ ಮರ್ಯಾಂ 1144ನೆ
ನಂಬರ್ ಅರ್ಜಿಪ್ಪಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಪ್ರೈಕೆ—

ಮಂಗಳಕೆಕೆಲ್ಲಿರುವ ತಮಿಲರಿಗೆ
ಕಳಿಸಲ್ಲಿಂ.

ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕೆಕೆ-ಳ
ಹಿಂಗಿಲುಪ್ಪಿ— ಈ ಅರ್ಜಿಕೆ-ನುಸರಿಸಿ
ನಡತೆಯಿಲಿವನಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುವಪ್ಪಕೆಕೆಕಾರಣ
ಳಪ್ಪಿಲ್ಲಿರುವನನ್ನವಂದುವರುಷಕ್ಕಿನಪ್ಪಿ
ತೆ ವಂಡಿಕ್ಕಿಂಡದಭಿಪ್ರವರಿಸಿಂಗಳಲ್ಲಿ
ರ್ಜಿಮಾಂಡಿರುವಿಕ್ಕಿವ ನಪ್ಪಿಂತೆಯಿರ್ದರೆ
ವೊಕ್ಕಾಂ
ತಾರೀಖು ವಲಾಂಸಾಂಲುರೆ ಚಾರಿಬಿಡ್ಡಾಂ Photographic Copy in Kannada ಈ
ಬಿ ಸಿನದರಿ ಅರ್ಚಕೆ-ನನಡಚೆಕವುಕ
ಈಲುಪ್ಪಿ— ಈ ವಸ್ತುಗಳಂತೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ

శ్రీ ఎస్ వి విజిలెన్స్ పోలీసుందరి మ్రొక్కలోని
కడపకి లేఖ

తే. 19. 1. 97. నుండి వ్రాయునది

ఇట్లు

[illegible]

ఆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 1758

(2-3)

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

Murrai Department

No: 175

Name & address of Petr:

Date of Petn 27.7.97

Date of Receipt 28.7.97

Abstract

28/7/97

COURT FEE

ONE ANNA

1

95

ਸਾਰੀ ਜਾਣਕਾਰੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਜਾਵੇ ਜੀ ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਜੀ

No. 735

5626

Muzrai Superintendent

Eng Refuse
21-3-98

Agriculture

Regd/3

17

BANGALORE
INC
4408
11-18-3-1998

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

Registered No.— 1964

Name of Petitioner— ಮುಂಗಡಿಕ್ಕೆ
ಬಾ ಕೆಂಪಿ ರಾಮೇಶ್ವರದ
Address ಅಚ್ಚೋಕ ಕು ಮುಂದ
ಸಾದಿಲ್ಲಿಕ್ಕೆ.

Date of Petition— 20-6-98

Date of Receipt— 21-6-98

No. of Enclosures—

Abstract

ತನ್ನ ಅಚ್ಚ
ನೆಂತರಿ ಬಾಬುಲು ಸ-ವ
ಗಳ್ಳತಲಬು- ವುತ್ತಪ
ರದ ವಿಷಯವಡ್ಲು ತೆಲಿಕ
ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಮುಂಡಲಲ್ಲ ವಾಂಡ್ಲ
ಲಿಂದ, ಗದರಿತಲಬು, ವ
ಕೆರ, ಲಿಯವುಗಳ್ಳಲಕೊಂಡಿಗಿ
ವದಲದೆ ತನಗೆಬದಲ
ಗರಚಿ ಕೊಂಡಿಗಬೇಕಿ

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 21-6-98
No 1964
POLITICAL BRANCH.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date MAY 31 1899
REG. No 1610
MUZRAI BRANCH

11.9.99

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE,
[illegible] DEPARTMENT.

Name of Petr.

Date of Petition

No. 3341 Date of Registering 11-9-99

Rural Jumma
Survey note
Akki- no 47
10 Kl
OFFICE
RECEIVED
Date
REG No. 472
MUZRAT DEPT.

2

3

4

7





has been sent

Muz. No. 1]

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT 3/

Call for report and reasons why the Petitioners did not obtain the orders of Govt before ~~[illegible]~~ executing the deed (Refer to former order)
KR
23/4/01

Registered No.— 1194.

Name of Petitioner— Ramaswami Sastri and others of Magadi

Address—

Date of Petition— 19. 4. 1901

Date of Receipt— 20. 4. 1901

No. of Enclosures—

Abstract

The petrs state that Kumari Lakshmi ~~who was Trustee~~ Archak of the Sri Rameswara Temple at Magadi, who was suspended by Govt for misconduct

in the office of the
Dr. and that
the person unfit-
to do Puja in the
Temple; the just
person that Kumari
Dr. which may be
Summoned for the
Office
Asst

Reg: No.
H.P.S. [illegible]

(1)

[illegible]

[illegible] 1901 [illegible] 19 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ

ಸಹಿ

ಸಹಿ

ಸಹಿ

No. 1098 Enc
Mus F 6-98

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 1174
dated 17th April 1901 received at the
Dewan's Office from certain
residents of Magadi

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
~~enclosures~~, to the Dy Commr
Bangalore District for report.

In the above, the petrs
state that Komara Deekshit,
Archak of Sri Rameswarasa Devarus
temple at Magadi who was
suspended by Govt for misconduct
has been reinstated in the Office,
that he is not fit to do
Puja in the temple by reason of
his bad character & that he
may be removed from service

By Order,

24/4/01

Dy Muzrai Secretary

BANGALORE,
April 190

with ref. to this
~~The Commissioner is to draw the~~
the Dy Commr's attention is drawn to the
orders contained in para 2 of
this Office No 810 dt 3rd Feb. 1896
~~he is requested to state~~ under what authority
~~to explain~~ & under what circs the Archak
was reinstated without the
previous sanction of Govt

ಕಂಡಾಯಿಕ್ಕಿ ಸಂಜಾಯಿಸಿ ಕಲ್ಲಿಂಗೆ ಕಿಲ್ಲಿಯಿಂ ಕಾಲಿಕ್ಕಿ ಎಂಬಾಗಳ್

(General Serial No. 30.) 12986

1901 6-5-01.

From The Commissioner of the Bangalore Dt

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore Rev. dept.

Dated 3rd May 1901

Despatched

Received

General No. ____ 1901.

Enclosures Number.



Submitted with reference

ks

9/5/01

Acknowledge the receipt

9/5/01

Ref. office memo: No 1098 dy 25 A-1701 dy 26-98

explaining the circumstances under which the archaka of the Ramalingeswara temple at Nandi was suspended

Muzrai Br

6-5-01

Bangalore District

Deputy Commissioner's Office

Camp Vadavatta, 3rd May 1901

To

The Deputy Secretary to the

Government of Mysore

Rev: & Pb Depttt.

With reference to your Official memorandum No. 1098 dated the 25th April 1901, enquiring under what authority and under what circumstances Archak Komara Deekshatha of Nageswara Swamy temple at Nagadi, had suspension had been directed by Government order No. 9100 of the 3rd February 1896, I beg to invite reference to the correspondence ending with the Government Proceedings No. 1030 of the 6th March 1899, from which it

it will be seen that he was reinstated some 2 years ago on the expiry of the period of suspension.

2. His case recently again engaged the Assistant Commissioner's attention on the ground that he misappropriated some of the proceeds of the temple. On his appeal, the Assistant Commissioner, was asked to give him if he has done any selection but nothing more than for some months and as the order of suspension was recalled, it was thought best to continue it again & enquiry on mere allegations. His presence in the premises will hinder or mar the proceedings. When the result of the investigation will be known.

3. The petition received with the official Memorandum

RECEIVED
Date
Regd. No. 12364
Revenue Branch

arrs

-5-01

1901

~~180~~

No. 2152

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy and others

Village
Taluk Magadi

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 19-4-01

Date of Receipt 22-4-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

The petitioners state that, under the orders of the Sub Division officer, Honnariah, Archak of Hole Rameswara, Someswara and Gavi Ganga swara, was removed from his immorality, misappropriation of the temple lands jewels &c.; and that they now hear that the Deputy Comr has ordered that the said Honnaiah should be

Rec'd
2/5/01

5/5/01

Submitted

The Dy Comr's further report promised in his letter dated 3rd May 1901 may be awaited

RS
1/5/01

1/5
6/9
25/5/11

2152





35

2152R
22-4-1901



20-5-01

152 [illegible]

1-5-01 [illegible]

3/5

Transferred to Mysore Branch in continuation

·5·01

132/7

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
1900 — 01
Dec
Regd. No 1389
MUZRAI BRANCH

No. 2383

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy Sastry & other residents of

Village } Magadi

Taluk }

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 5-5-01

Date of Receipt 13-5-01

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT

State that they submitted 2 Registered petitions praying that Komaraiya Archak of Kote Rameswara & other temples who had been dismissed from office should not be re-employed as directed by the Dy. Comr; but received no orders; that besides addressing petitions to the deputy Comr. they represented to him on 4-5-01, on the occasion his visit to Di

that Subramanya Dikshit
who was permenantly
appointed in place of Komanaya
should be allowed to continue
as the latter was irreligious
but were told that they
& their request could not
be granted; and that the
institution which is an
old one is meant for the
use of the people as well as
for praying the longevity of
the Sovereign -

Pray that with reference
to the report of the Amildar
and that of Sub. Dy officer
dy 1.4.01 on the subject,
the Dy: Comr's order may
be cancelled and equitable
orders passed.

CA
17/5/01

9

9-4-1907

2382

2383 R
13-5-1907.

ದಿ ಯೂನಿಯನ್ ಆಫ್ ಇಂಡಿಯಾ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು

ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ

ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲು ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ

ಎಂಬ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ತಿರಸ್ಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ

ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ

ಯಾವುದೇ ಪುರಾವೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲ. 1-4-91ರಿಂದ

ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲು

ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದು

ಸಹ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಿಂದ ಸಾಬೀತಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು

ಪರಿಗಣಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ

ಯಾವುದೇ ಪುರಾವೆಗಳಿಲ್ಲ.

Date 1901

Reg. No.

No. 21-05

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy Sastry & others

Village Jesidurgam

Taluk Nagara Kavalam

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 10th Jan 1902

Date of Receipt 15-1-1902

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure —

ABSTRACT

State that they had presented an application dated 22.11.01 concerning the misappropriation of temple property by Archaka Ramaniah that they received endt. No 8984-4-01 from this office to the effect that their application had been forwarded to the Sylkm that the complaint was lodged in the Magistrate Court of Closepet Sub-Dn that Ramaniah was sentenced to one years imprisonment and a fine of Rs 100

MGCPB—23-3-01—3 000.

Eat from that time, the
he of the temple he as
u closed with any
or ship
hat on appeal, Komaeah
a set at liberty
at they hear, that a
marriage will be e-
tered to his Commer
pisonment
ary that on perusal
the records, ju st order
will be passed in the matter
2/15
2/11/02

2105 R
15-1-1902



OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 706
MUZRAI BRANCH

MUZRAI

1901

From

To The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Dated 8th February 1902

Despatched

Received

General No. 1205

Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure No.

His Letter no 124 d/
3rd May 1901 ~~forwarding~~
~~a bond and further report~~
reporting that a prosecution
had been directed against
Kumara Deekshit, Archik
of Rameswara Devaru temple
at Magadi.

"

Has the honor to draw
attention to the above
and to request that the
result of the trial and
the action taken ~~by the~~
subsequently may be
intimated.

MGCPB--11-1-1901—1500

to this office early

Dft.

Ltr

1901/02



FROM

The Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

The Dy Secy to the
Govt of Mysore
Muzrai Dept

Dated 21st
Despatched 22nd } February 1902
Received

General No.
Dy No. 2178

Enclosure No.

Submitted for orders

25/2/02

Yes.
There will be an
appeal from the deserved
Archak. When the matter
may be posted up
15/3/02

Dy Secy's docket No 1205 of the
month-28

8th February 1902.

Reports the result of the trial
action
and the steps taken subsequently
against Kumara Deekshit,
Archak of Rameswaraswamy
temple at Magadi

6

L No 91.

Bangalore District
Deputy Commissioner's office
Bangalore 21st February 1902.

From,

M. S. Narayana Rao Esquire,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To,

L. Anantasawmy Row Esquire, B.A.
Acting Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Judicial Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket
No. 1205 / Judl. No. 6-98 dated the 8th instant,
requesting to report the result
of the trial and the action taken
subsequently against Kumara
Deekshit, Archika of Ramanuja
Devaru temple at Nagadi, I have
the honour to state that on perusing
the judgment of the Chief Court I
found it impossible to restore the
Appointment in the office of Pujari
of

of the Temple. The jewels of the Temple have been found missing and the Brahmins unable to account for them. He had further the hereditary right to mortgage the landed property of the Temple and had the authority to say that he was pressed for money to pay the expenses of answering the complaints preferred against him.

I have for these reasons dismissed him from service and ordered the Tahsildar to send up for payment the following up the vacancy.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Commissioner
Bangalore District.